

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

The telephonic interview was conducted on November 9, 2009 and attended by the Primary Examiner Anish Gupta and the Examiner Julie Ha and the undersigned attorney.

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1 and 12

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

Prior art cited in the most recent Office Action

Proposed Amendments

Possible amendments to the claims similar to those set forth above were generally discussed.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

After the Applicants explained the invention to the Examiners, the Examiners indicated that they found the previous wording of the claims to be confusing. After the explanation and discussion of the invention, Examiner Gupta suggested that the claim be rewritten so as to clearly express what the claim was intended to encompass. In this regard, one of the areas of confusion was whether the phosphorylatable portion and the specificity conferring portion were part of the same polypeptide sequence or merely conjugated in some way. Applicants suggested that this confusion might be addressed by amending the claim to recite that the "polypeptide has a sequence comprising..." The Examiners also were confused as to the role of the specific binding partner. Applicants suggested that the functional language regarding the specific binding partner was present to define a limitation of the phosphorylatable portion as set forth in a previous version of the claim when the phosphorylatable portion was recited more broadly. Now that the phosphorylatable portion has been limited to SEQ ID NO:6, its ability to be recognized in its phosphorylated or non-phosphorylated state is an inherent property of SEQ ID NO:6. Thus, Applicants suggested that this functional language be deleted.

Results of Interview

The Examiners requested that Applicants file an Amendment after Final and that they would review the amended claim. In addition, the Examiners' indication was that once the claim

Appl. No. : 10/510,875
Filed : June 27, 2005

was recited in a clearer format and that support for such claim amendments was presented, that the claim would be favorably considered.